

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

---

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, <i>et al.</i>	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 4:05-cv-00329-GKF-PJC
	)	
TYSON FOODS, INC., <i>et al.</i>	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS IN  
LIMINE PERTAINING TO ALTERNATE SOURCES OF PHOSPHORUS AND  
BACTERIA TO THE IRW [Dkt. No. 2436] AND BACTERIAL OR PHOSPHORUS  
LEVELS IN OTHER WATERSHEDS [Dkt. No. 2411]**

EXHIBIT 2  
Transcript of July 29, 2009 Hearing

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel, )  
W.A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )  
capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )  
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )  
et al. )

Plaintiffs, )

vs. )

CASE NO. 05-CV-329-GKF-PJC

TYSON FOODS, INC., et al., )

Defendants. )

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
JULY 29, 2009  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE GREGORY K. FRIZZELL, DISTRICT JUDGE  
MOTION HEARING, VOLUME II

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

MR. DAVID RIGGS  
MR. DAVID P. PAGE  
MR. RICHARD T. GARREN  
Riggs Abney Neal Turpen  
Orbison & Lewis  
502 W. 6th Street  
Tulsa, OK 74119

1 (APPEARANCES CONTINUED)

2 For the Plaintiffs:

MR. ROBERT A. NANCE  
MS. KELLY FOSTER  
Riggs Abney Neal Turpen  
Orbison & Lewis  
5801 Broadway, Extension 101  
Oklahoma City, OK 73118

MR. LOUIS W. BULLOCK  
Bullock Bullock & Blakemore  
110 W. 7th St.  
Suite 770  
Tulsa, OK 74119

MR. FREDERICK C. BAKER  
MS. ELIZABETH CLAIRE XIDIS  
Motley Rice LLC  
28 Bridgeside  
P.O. Box 1792  
Mount Pleasant, SC 29465

12

13 For Tyson Foods:

MR. ROBERT W. GEORGE  
Tyson Foods, Inc.  
2210 West Oaklawn Drive  
Springdale, AR 72701

15

MR. JAY THOMAS JORGENSEN  
MR. GORDON D. TODD  
Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K St. NW  
Washington, DC 20005

18

MR. PATRICK MICHAEL RYAN  
Ryan Whaley Coldiron and  
Shandy PC  
119 N. Robinson, Rm 900  
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

21

22 For Cargill:

MR. JOHN H. TUCKER  
MS. THERESA HILL  
Rhodes Hieronymus Jones  
Tucker & Gable  
100 W. 5th St., Ste 400  
Tulsa, OK 74103

24

25

1 (APPEARANCES CONTINUED)

2 For Cargill: MR. DELMAR R. EHRLICH  
3 MS. KRISANN C. KLEIBACKER LEE  
4 Faerge & Benson  
90 S. 7th St., Ste 2200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

5 For Simmons Foods: MR. JOHN R. ELROD  
6 MS. VICKI BRONSON  
7 Conner & Winters  
211 E. Dickson St.  
Fayetteville, AR 72701

8 For Peterson Farms: MR. A. SCOTT MCDANIEL  
9 MR. PHILIP HIXON  
MS. NICOLE LONGWELL  
10 McDaniel Hixon Longwell &  
Acord PLLC  
320 S. Boston, Ste 700  
11 Tulsa, OK 74103

12 For George's: MR. WOODY BASSETT  
13 MR. VINCENT O. CHADICK  
Bassett Law Firm  
14 P.O. Box 3618  
Fayetteville, AR 72702

15 For Cal-Maine: MR. ROBERT SANDERS  
16 Young Williams P.A.  
P.O. Box 23059  
17 Jackson, MS 39225  
18 MR. ROBERT P. REDEMANN  
Perrine McGivern Redemann  
19 Reid Berry & Taylor PLLC  
P.O. Box 1710  
20 Tulsa, OK 74101  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1           Number 4. Dr. Olsen's approach does not account for  
2 alternative sources of most of the constituents in his PCA.

3           Number 5. The published literature states that --  
4 and before I do this, let me find out, did the -- do the  
5 defendants contend that the software package actually now  
6 replaces the missing values with a mean, Mr. Todd?

7           MR. TODD: Your Honor, it's our understanding that  
8 Dr. Olsen works -- we accept the representation by plaintiffs  
9 that he used the pairwise deletion function. Because of the  
10 manner in which Dr. Olsen had treated the data, he had done  
11 something called a Z transformation, which basically wraps the  
12 data around zero. So the mean was zero. So it was a  
13 mathematical equivalent. Running the pairwise was the  
14 mathematical equivalent of replacing everything with a mean.  
15 So we're happy to accept their representation.

16           THE COURT: Does that eliminate your objection?

17           MR. TODD: No, it doesn't, Your Honor, because our  
18 objection was to the effect of having missing data.

19           THE COURT: That's what I understood.

20           So Number 5. The published literature states that  
21 when a software package replaces missing values with means of  
22 the variables, this can bias statistical analysis if these  
23 values represent a significant number of the data being  
24 analyzed. Here, the replaced data represent a significant  
25 number of the data analyzed; thus, rendering the data